UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/516,670	03/01/2000	Kenichi Seino	9281-3582	3796

757 7590 06/03/2004

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER	
YE, LIN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2612	11

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/516,670	Applicant(s) SEINO ET AL.	
	Examiner Lin Ye	Art Unit 2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 March 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 3/11/004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as to claims 1-8 and 11.

For claim 1, the applicant argues that Hanagata's contour –adjusting circuit (constant generating circuit 4) does not even receive Y (Luminance) signal as its input. The examiner disagrees. The Hanagata reference clearly shows in Figures 1, 2A, the constant generating circuit receives a vertical edge signal from the luminance (Y) signal processing circuit (10) for generating a luminance (Y) signal, and the vertical edge signal only has the Y signal component and does not has color difference signal components (Cr and Cb) (see Col. 4, lines 34-38).

The applicant also argues that Tanji reference does not peaking the R, G, and B signals. It should be noted the Tanji reference discloses a contour enhancement circuit 16 by adding a detail signal to the signals DR, DG and DB and adjusting (peaking) the signals DR, DG and DB to contour enhanced signals DR1, DG1 and DB1 (See Col. 3, lines 47-52). This can be considered as peaking the R, G, and G signals.

2. Applicant's amendments with respect to new claims 9-10 filed on 3/11/02 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Referring to claim 1, the claim discloses a limitation " a **contour-adjusting circuit** for performing contour adjustment by peaking R, G, B... **or** by peaking only a Y signal..." . It would only request either one of condition of peaking R,G,B or peaking Y signal to meet this claimed limitation. However, the claim also discloses another limitation " a **selecting circuit** at least one switch, in accordance with **the type of input video signals**....". In the case, it would include two types of input video signals such signal (R,G, B) or signal (Y, Pr, Pb) for selecting. Those two limitations conflict with each other.

The examiner suggest the applicant amend claim 1 to -- ...a contour-adjusting circuit for performing contour adjustment by peaking R, G, B... **and** by peaking only a Y signal...--

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagata U.S. Patent 5,953,058 in view of Sugiyama et al. U.S. Patent 6,262,779 and Tanji et al. U.S. Patent 5,767,900.

Referring to claims 1, 5-8 and 11, the Hanagata reference discloses in Figure 2 A, a video signal processing circuit comprising: a contour-adjusting (edge-adjusting) circuit (constant generating circuit 4) by peaking only a Y signal among transmission color signals in a high

definition television system (input signals of the HDTV are the Y, Cr and Cb) and for outputting at least one adjusted signal (e.g. adjusted signal is for avoiding spurious color singles in the edge, See Col. 4, lines 65-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-15); and the Pr (Cr) signal and the Pb (Cb) signal, in which the contour adjustment is not performed; an inverse matrix transforming circuit (primary color generation circuit 21 and a constant multiplying circuit 5) for separating by performing inverse matrix transformation, the R, G, and B signals from the adjusted Y Signal, a Pr (Cr) signal, and a Pb(Cb) signal among the transmission color signals and for outputting the separated R, G, and B signals (See, Col. 5, lines 37-42). However, the reference does not explicitly disclose a selecting circuit for selecting with the type of input video signals such as NTSC/PAL or HDTV video signals.

The Sugiyama reference discloses in Figure 1, a video signal processing apparatus including a NTSC signal input terminal (1), a HDTV signal input terminal (2), a PC signal input terminal (3), and a selecting circuit (switch 4) for selecting the type of input video signals inputted into the input terminals 1,2 and 3. The Sugiyama reference is evidence that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to see more advantages for a video signal processing system is not limited by the type of input video signals so that has more flexibility to process video signals in low cost and power consuming. For that reason, it would have been obvious to see the video signal processing circuit has the selecting circuit for selecting with the type of input video signals such as NTSC/PAL or HDTV video signals for performing the contour adjustment disclosed by Hanagata.

The Hanagata and Sugiyama references do not explicitly show the contour adjustment is performed on the input R, G, B video signals when the NTSC/PAL system is selected.

The Tanji reference discloses in Figures 1-2, a video signal process apparatus comprising a contour-adjusting circuit (contour enhancement circuit 16) for performing contour adjustment by peaking R, G, and B signals among video signals in an NTSV/PAL system (See Col. 4, lines 4-8 and lines 48-55). The Tanji reference is evidence that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to see more advantages for a video signal processing system performing contour adjustment by peaking R, G, and B signals for suppressing a blurred contours and increasing image quality. For that reason, it would have been obvious to see the video signal processing circuit can perform contour adjustment in the R, G, and B signals disclosed by Hanagata.

Referring to claims 2-4, a viewfinder apparatus for a television camera (video camera disclosed in Hanagata reference) comprising a display device (CRT 11 disclosed in Sugiyama reference, Figure 1) using a video signal processing circuit (luminance signal processing circuit 10 and chroma signal processing circuit 20) as set forth in claim 1.

6. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagata U.S. Patent 5,953,058 in view of Sugiyama et al. U.S. Patent 6,262,779, Tanji et al. U.S. Patent 5,767,900 and Schwartz U.S. Patent 3,980,819.

Referring to claims 9-10, the Hanagata, Sugiyama and Tanji references disclose all subject matter as discussed in respected claim 1, 5-8 and 11, except the reference does not explicitly has a detail about the peaking circuit in the contour-adjusting circuit which includes at least one delay circuit, at least one subtractor circuit and at least one adder circuit and appending circuit to form a peaked signal.

The Schwartz reference discloses in Figure 13, the edge enhancement system has a signal peaking circuit comprising delay circuit (delay line 74, 78), subtractor circuit (difference amplify 75, see Col. 9, lines 7-12) and adder circuit (adder 80, See Col. 9, lines 25-30). The Schwartz reference is an evidence that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to see more advantages for the edge enhancement system has a signal peaking circuit which including such delay circuit, subtractor and adder for peaking the edge signal so that can improves the sharpness of television images and correcting display significantly (See Col. 3, lines 4-10). For that reason, it would have been obvious to see the peaking circuit in the contour-adjusting circuit which includes at least one delay circuit, at least one subtractor circuit and at least one adder circuit and appending circuit to form a peaked signal disclosed by Hanagata, Sugiyama and Tanji.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to

37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Lin Ye** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3250**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy R Garber can be reached on (703) 305-4929.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Lin Ye
May 20, 2004

WENDY R. GARBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600